

Honorable Kymberly K. Evanson

**COURT’S RULINGS ON OBJECTIONS TO
DESIGNATIONS OF DEPOSITION EXCERPTS (DKT. NO. 92)**

DEPOSITION OF CORY BRICKMAN (USA 30(b)(6))

Taken on December 13, 2023

Perkins v. USA

Western Washington District Court

No. 3:22-cv-05701-KKE

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT’S RULING
45:23-24	Designation contains objection.	Response: 45:18- 46:3 Counter designation added for clarity and completeness of testimony. Relevance, Vague, Misleading.	OVERRULED (hereinafter “O”)
50:20 - 52:5	Calls for a legal conclusion, lacks foundation, assumes facts not in evidence.		O
52:16-17	Designation contains objection.	Response: 52:15- 53:2- Counter-designation added for completeness. Calls for speculation FRE 602	O

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT'S RULING
53:8	Designation contains objection.	Response: 53:6-17 Counter-designation added for completeness. Vague, Misleading FRE 611, 401	O
55:12-13	Designation contains objection.	Response: 55:7-18 Counter-designation added for completeness. Calls for speculation FRE 602	O
59:24	Designation contains objection.	Response: 59:21- 60:1 Counter-designation added for completeness. Vague, Misleading, compound question.	O
60:5	Designation contains objection.	Response: 60:2 -16 Counter-designation added for completeness. Vague Misleading FRE 611, 401 Calls for speculation 602, calls for a legal conclusion FRE 704	O

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT'S RULING
60:10-11	Designation contains objection.	Response: 60:2 -16 Counter-designation added for completeness. Vague Misleading FRE 611, 401 Calls for speculation 602, calls for a legal conclusion FRE 704	O
61:2-3	Designation contains objection.	Response: 60:23- 61:6 Counter-designation added for completeness. Calls for speculation, calls for a legal conclusion, compound question	O
62:2-3	Designation contains objection.	Response: 61:22- 62:5 Counter designation added for completeness. Calls for a legal conclusion FRE 704	O
62:10-11	Designation contains objection.	Response: 62:6-19 Counter-designation added for completeness. Calls for a legal conclusion, vague as to "all evidence", "regulations", "complied", assumes facts not in evidence.	O

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT'S RULING
62:20-63:18	Calls for a legal conclusion, lacks foundation.	Response: 62:20-63:18 Counter designation added for completeness, context and clarity of Plaintiffs designation starting at 63:19.	O
63:24-64:1	Designation contains objection.	Response: 63:19- 64:3. Counter-designation added for completeness. Asked and answered, Calls for a legal conclusion, vague as to "regulations"	O
64:8-9	Designation contains objection.	Response: 64:4-14 Counter-designation added for completeness. Calls for a legal conclusion, vague as to "investigate" and "mandatory regulations", assumes facts not in evidence	O
66:22-68:8	Calls for a legal conclusion, lacks foundation, designations includes objections.	Response: 66:22-.68:8 does not call for a legal conclusion, question asks if witness has reason to disagree and witness answers from his knowledge. Does not lack foundation	SUSTAINED (hereinafter "S") See Dkt. No. 100 at 10.
69:3- 71:12	Hearsay, document speaks for itself, reading into record is a waste of time. Rule of Completeness. Attorney testimony		O

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT'S RULING
71:15-18	Calls for a legal conclusion, lacks foundation, designation includes objection.	Response: 71:13-72:1 Counter- designation added for completeness. Calls for a legal conclusion FRE 704	O
72:1-17	Calls for speculation, lacks foundation, designations includes objections.	Response: 72:1- 17 Counter-Designation included for completeness of response Plaintiff designated at 71:23-72:1. Response: 72:11- 25 Counter- Designation Included for completeness of incomplete designation by Plaintiff starting at 72:18 Assumes facts not in evidence, vague, misleading	O
73:14-75:3	Calls for speculation, lacks foundation.	Response: 73:14 - 75:3 Counter-Designation included for Completeness, clarifying prior answer designated by Plaintiff	O
75:10-11	Designation contains objection	Response: 75:4- 76:1 Counter-designation added for completeness. asked and answered, vague, misleading, compound question	O

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT'S RULING
76:2- 78:13	Attorney testifying, hearsay, document speaks for itself		O
78:14 - 24	relevance		O
78:25-80:3	Vague, calls for speculation, relevance.	Response: 78:25 - 80:3 Counter- designation Included for Completeness, clarifies prior discussion and question and answer designated by Plaintiff starting at 78:14	O
80:22	Designation contains objection.	Response: 80:17- 81: 1 Counter- designation added for completeness. Vague, misleading. misstates evidence	O
81:9-16	Vague, Relevance, misleading.		O
81:21	Designation contains objection.	Response: 81:17 - 82:18, counter-designation added for completeness. Vague	O
83:17-21	Relevance, outside the time frame of this case, calls for speculation.		O

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT'S RULING
84:11-13	Designation contains objection. The size and operation of PSNS's industrial hygiene department in 1972 is unquestionably relevant to the allegations in this case.	Response: 83:22- 84:16 Counter-designation added for context. Outside the scope of topics for the 30(b)(6) witness, Relevance	O
85:11-13	Designation contains objection. Inquiry did not seek work product.	Response: 85:6-16 Counter designation added for context and completeness. Outside the scope of topics for the 30(b)(6) witness, Relevance, Calls for a legal conclusion, misstates evidence and prior testimony	O
85:23-25	Designation contains objection.	Response: 85:17- 86:3 counter designation added for completeness. Calls for a legal conclusion, Assumes facts not in evidence, misleading, misstates the evidence and prior testimony	O
86:10-11	Designation contains objection.	Response: 86:4-18 counter-designation added for completeness. Calls for a legal conclusion, assumes facts, not in evidence, misstates the evidence and prior testimony.	O

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT'S RULING
87:13-15	Calls for speculation.	Response: 87:13-15 counter-designation included for completeness of response	O
87:16- 18	Vague, asked and answered		O
87:17	Designation contains objection.		O
87:21-88:19	Designation contains objection.	Response: 87:21 - 88:19 counter designation added to provide context of prior answer designated by Plaintiff	O
94:20-95:1	Designation contains objection.	Response: 94:20 - 95:10 Counter designation Provides context for the response. Calls for speculation, vague.	O
97:2	Designation contains objection.	Response: 96:24 - 97: 22 Provides context for the response. lacks foundation	O
98:8	Designation contains objection.	Response: 98:6 - 10 Counter designation added for completeness. lacks foundation, vague.	O

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT'S RULING
98:11-99:3	Calls for a legal conclusion, lacks foundation.	Response: 98:11- 99:3 Counter designation Provides context and completeness for the prior response designated by Plaintiff at 98:6.	O
99:4 - 102:20	unclear time frame, document hard to read, relevance, foundation		O
103:2	Designation contains objection.	Response: 102:21 - 103: 6 Counter designation provides complete answer and response. Lacks foundation, compound question.	O
103:12-13	Designation contains objection.	Response: 103:7- 15 counter designation provides complete answer and response. Lacks foundation, calls for legal conclusion	O
103:16-104:24	hearsay, attorney testifying		O
105:6-7	Designation contains objection.	Response: 104:25 - 106:2 Calls for a legal conclusion, misleading. provides complete response	O

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT'S RULING
106:7-8	Designation contains objection.	Response 106:3-22 Counter designation provides complete response vague, misleading, calls for a legal conclusion.	O
107:15-108:17	Incomplete designation that does not include the relevant question. Vague, calls for speculation.	Response: 107:15- 108:17 counter designation provides context for incomplete designation starting at 108:18	O
108:23-24	Designation contains objection.	Response: 108:18-109:3 counter designation provided for completeness. calls for a legal conclusion, vague.	O
110:1-3	Designation contains objection.	Response: 109:20- 110:8 Counter designation included for completeness. Asked and answered, vague.	O
110:18-19	Designation contains objection.	Response: 110:14-23 Counter designation included for completeness. calls for a legal conclusion, asked and answered	O
111:16-112:10	Lacks foundation, calls for speculation and a legal conclusion.	Response: 111:16-112:10 testifying in capacity as 30(b)(6) witness.	S See Dkt. No. 100 at 10.
112:17-18	Designation contains objection.	Response: 112:11- 113:5 Counter designation provided full answer. Vague, misleading question.	O

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT'S RULING
112:21-113:5	Lacks foundation, calls for speculation and a legal conclusion.	Response: 112:11- 113:5 Counter designation provided full answer. Vague, misleading question.	O
113:12-114:24	Lacks foundation, calls for speculation and a legal conclusion. Designation also contains objection.	Response: 113:12- 114:24 responding to question regarding US position in capacity as 30(b)(6) witness.	O
115:3-4	Designation contains objection.	Response: 114:25 -115:8 Counter designation provided for completeness. Calls for legal conclusion	O
115:13-14	Designation contains objection.	Response: 115:9-16 Counter designation provided for completeness. calls for expert testimony / legal conclusion	O
117:15-16	Designation contains objection.	Response: 117:10-21 Counter designation provided for completeness. Calls for expert testimony. provides context of response	O
118:9-10	Designation contains objection.	Response: 118:6 - 119:2 Counter designation provided for completeness. calls for expert testimony.	O

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT'S RULING
120:2-3	Designation contains objection.	Response: 119:23 - 120:11 counter designation provides context for the response Vague, assumes facts not in evidence and calls for speculation	O
121:12-19	Calls for expert testimony		S
122:19-20	Designation contains objection.	Response: 122:14 - 123:12 Counter designation Provides context for the response Foundation, calls for speculation, calls for expert testimony, outside the topics for 30(b)(6) witness.	O
123:4-8	Designation contains objection.	Response: 122:14 - 123:12 Counter designation Provides context for the response Foundation, calls for speculation, calls for expert testimony, outside the topics for 30(b)(6) witness.	O
125:2-3	Designation contains objection.	Response: 124:25-125:12 Counter designation provides context. Foundation, calls for speculation, calls for expert testimony, outside the topics for 30(b)(6) witness.	O

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT'S RULING
125:16-17	Designation contains objection.	Response: 125:13-22 Counter designation provides context for response. calls for expert testimony, vague.	O
130:14-15	Designation contains objection.	Response: 130:8 - 131:3 Counter-designation provides context for response. Calls for expert testimony, vague, misleading.	O
149:24-150:13	Calls for speculation, lacks foundation.	Response: 149:24-150:13 Witness testifying in capacity as 30(b)(6) witness	S See Dkt. No. 100 at 10.
152:3-22	attorney testifying reading document.		O
153:3-9	attorney testifying reading document.		O
154:1-24	attorney testifying reading document.		O
155:4-5	Designation contains objection.	Response: 154:25-155:12 counter- designation provides context for answer	O
155:13- 157:13	attorney testifying reading document.		O

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT'S RULING
159:9	Designation contains objection.	Response: 159:5-11 counter Designation provides context for the answer. Calls for speculation	O
161:13-14	Designation contains objection.	Response: 161:9 -24 counter designation provided for completeness. relevance, Misleading, vague.	O
162:17-18	Designation contains objection.	Response: 162:15 - 22 counter designation provides completeness. Calls for speculation, vague.	O
163:16-17	Designation contains objection.	Response: 163:13-19 counter Designation provides context for answer. relevance, Misleading.	O
174:8- 179:15	relevance, object to the extent it is outside the time frame of this case.		O
179:22-181:1	relevance, object to the extent it is outside the time frame of this case.		O
181:4-184:16	relevance, object to the extent it is outside the time frame of this case.		O
184:21-22	Designation contains objection.	Response: 184: 17- 185:1 counter Designation provides context for answer relevance, calls for speculation, misleading.	O

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT'S RULING
185:6-9	Designation contains objection.	Response: 185:6-9 Counter- Designation provides context or responses in previously designated materials (e.g. Page 181) relevance, calls for speculation, misleading.	O
186:22-23	Designation contains objection.	Response: 186:17-187: 24 counter designation Provides complete response.	O
186:24-188:20	Calls for speculation, Mr. Brickman's familiarity with "today's standards" is irrelevant to the disputed issues in this case.	Response: 186:17-187: 24 counter designation Provides complete response. Response: 187:25-188:20 mischaracterizes testimony, question asks "during 1970-1974 time frame" Witness is testifying from first hand knowledge	O
210:15-211:09	Calls for a legal conclusion, lacks foundation.	Response: 210:15-2:11 witness is testifying in capacity as 30(b)(6) witness	S See Dkt. No. 100 at 10.
215:6- 217:1	hearsay, relevance. Lacks foundation.		O

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT'S RULING
217:6-7	Designation contains objection.	Response: 217:2 - 8 Designation provides context for response. Misleading, calls for speculation, vague.	O
218:6- 219:14	Misleading, attorney testifying		O

DEPOSITION OF ROBERT NEAL (USA 30(b)(6))**Taken on December 13, 2023*****Perkins v. USA*****Western Washington District Court****No. 3:22-cv-05701-RJB**

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT'S RULING
9:15-10:1	Foundation, confusing, vague.		O
24:3-4	Designation contains objection.	US Response: 23:25-24:13 Counter-designation added for completeness. Misleading, vague, confusing and lacks foundation	O
25:20-21	Designation contains objection.	US Response: 25:14-23 Counter- designation added for completeness. Counsel testimony, leading question. Misleading, vague, confusing and lacks foundation	O
26:23-25	Designation contains objection.	US Response: 25:24-27:10 Counter- designation added for completeness. Hearsay, Misleading, vague, confusing and lacks foundation	O

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT'S RULING
29:23-24	Designation contains objection.	US Response: 28:12-30:6 Counter- designation added for completeness. Hearsay, Misleading, vague, confusing, counsel testifying, and lacks foundation	O
33:5	Designation contains objection.	US Response: 32:13-33:4 Counter- designation added for completeness. Lacks foundation, misleading, leading question.	O
33:9-10	Designation contains objection.	US Response: 33:6-22 Counter- designations added for completeness. Vague, misleading,	O
33:14-15	Designation contains objection.	US Response: 33:6-22 Counter- designations added for completeness. Vague, misleading,	O
33:20-21	Designation contains objection.	US Response: 33:6-22 Counter- designations added for completeness. Vague, misleading,	O
35:24-25	Designation contains objection.	US Response: 35:18-36:1 Counter- designation added for completeness. Vague, misleading, calls for speculation	O

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT'S RULING
40:5-7	Designation contains objection.	US Response: 39:20-40:15 Counter- designation added for completeness. assumes facts not in evidence, calls for speculation, vague, misleading	O
41:16-18	Designation contains objection.	US Response: 40:25-42:3 Counter- designation added for completeness. assumes facts not in evidence, calls for speculation, vague, misleading	O
42:1-2	Designation contains objection.	US Response: 40:25-42:3 Counter- designation added for completeness. assumes facts not in evidence, calls for speculation, vague, misleading	O
44:23-25	Designation contains objection.	US Response: 44:20-45:7 Counter- designation added for completeness. calls for speculation, misleading	O
46:19-20	Designation contains objection.	US Response: 46:13-47:16 Counter- designation added for completeness. calls for speculation, misleading, assumes facts not in evidence	O

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT'S RULING
47:8-10	Designation contains objection.	US Response: 46:13-47:16 Counter- designation added for completeness. calls for speculation, misleading, assumes facts not in evidence	O
47:11-15	Calls for speculation.	US Response: 46:13-47:16 Counter- designation added for completeness. calls for speculation, misleading, assumes facts not in evidence	O
51:16-23	calls for speculation, misleading, assumes facts not in evidence		O
53:22-23	Designation contains objection.	US Response: 53:8-54:3 Counter- designation added for completeness. Misleading, and relevancy. Ms. Perkins did not live near an asbestos plant or mine	O
54:4-55:6	Not relevant, lacks foundation, hearsay.		O
63:20-23	lacks foundation, confusing, vague.		O
72:14-18	Lacks foundation.	US Response: 72,14-18 counter designation added for completeness, context and clarity of testimony designated by Plaintiff at 73:16	O

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT'S RULING
72:23-73:15	Lacks foundation.	US Response: 72:23-73:15 counter designation added for completeness, context and clarity of testimony designated by Plaintiff at 73:16	O
73:16-22	lacks foundation, rule of completeness, vague, confusing.		O
75:10-13	Designation contains objection.	US Response: 75:1-15. counter designation added for completeness, context and clarity of testimony designated by Plaintiff. Lacks foundation, misleading, vague, document speaks for itself.	O
77:20-22	Designation contains objection.	US Response: 77:16-78:2 counter designation added for completeness, context and clarity of testimony designated by Plaintiff. calls for speculation, lacks foundation, assumes facts not in evidence.	O
78:7-9	Designation contains objection.	US Response: 78:3-10 counter designation added for completeness, context and clarity of testimony designated by Plaintiff. Lacks foundation, calls for speculation, assumes facts not in evidence.	O

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT'S RULING
78:24-25	Designation contains objection.	US Response: 78:11-79:1 counter designation added for completeness, context and clarity of testimony designated by Plaintiff. Vague, misleading, mis characterization of the evidence.	O
79:23-25	Designation contains objection.	US Response: 79:17-80:3 counter designation added for completeness, context and clarity of testimony designated by Plaintiff. Mis characterization of the evidence, vague, misleading.	O

DEPOSITION OF DANIEL BESSMER
Taken on January 7, 1980
Steele, et al. v. Johns-Manville Products Corp., etc., et al.
No. SOC 43247

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT'S RULING
57:7-12	Relevance, lack of foundation, designation does not include questions and relates to practices at Long Beach Naval Shipyard.	57:7-12: US Response: witness testifying from his own personal experience, relevant to how an instruction is implemented	O
72:6-13	Relevance, Mr. Perkins never worked in the insulation fabrication shop.	US Response: 72:6-13: Relevant to the policies and procedures at PSNS	O
72:24-73:1	Relevance.	US Response: 72:24-73:1 relevant to Mr. Bessmer's employment history at PSNS	O
75:9-76:5	Relevance, Mr. Perkins never worked as an insulator let alone in the insulation shop and this Court dismissed Plaintiff's claims based on the Navy's failure to provide Mr. Perkins with protective equipment like a dust respirator. DKT. 23	US Response: 75:9 -76:5 Relevant to the policies and procedures at PSNS	O
104:8-15	Lacks foundation.	104:8-15: US Response: witness testifying from first hand knowledge, added to ad context to Plaintiff's designation at 104:16-17	O

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT'S RULING
104:18-22	Calls for speculation.	104:18-22 US Response: Witness testifying from firsthand knowledge. Added for clarity of Plaintiff's designation before and after	0
105:6-13	Calls for speculation, lacks foundation.	US Response: 105:6-13: witness testifying from first hand knowledge. added for clarity to Plaintiff's prior designation.	0
107:2-11	Relevance, calls for speculation.	107:2-11: and 107:16-108:6: US Response: Relevant to the policies and procedures at PSNS Witness testifying from first hand knowledge	0
107:16-108:6	Relevance, calls for speculation.	107:2-11: and 107:16-108:6: US Response: Relevant to the policies and procedures at PSNS Witness testifying from first hand knowledge	0
108:10-16	Relevance, calls for speculation.	108:10-16 US Response: Relevant to the policies and procedures at PSNS Witness testifying from first hand knowledge	0
110:4-8	Relevance.		0

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT'S RULING
128:19-129:6	Relevance, Mr. Perkins never worked as an insulator let alone in the insulation shop and this Court dismissed Plaintiff's claims based on the Navy's failure to provide Mr. Perkins with protective equipment like a dust respirator. DKT. 23	128:19-129:6: US Response: Witness testifying from his personal first hand knowledge	O
135:15- 137:5	Relevance, unsure time frame these questions refer to, lacks foundation, vague.		O
145:13-22	Relevance, calls for a legal conclusion, lacks foundation.		O
149:7-150:9	Relevance, outside relevant time frame, lacks foundation, vague, confusing.		O

DEPOSITION OF CARL MANGOLD, VOLUME 1
Taken on December 2, 2004
Braaten v. Certainteed Corporation, et al.
149th Judicial District, Brazoria County District Court
Case No. 25489

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT'S RULING
25:7-27:8	Relevance, vague, unclear time frame.		O
28:24-29:22	Relevance, vague, unclear time frame.		O
42:22-43:16	Relevance, vague, unclear time frame.		O
51:8- 59:16	Relevance, vague, unclear time frame.		O
57: 4-13	Relevance- outside the time frame of this matter		O
74:7-75:17	Hearsay, relevance, lack of foundation.	US Response: 74:7- 75:17 Testifying from his own personal knowledge.	O
77:11-78:2	Relevance, Mr. Perkins never worked as an insulator let alone in the insulation shop.		S
78:21-81:25	Relevance, lack of foundation, calls for speculation. There is no evidence that any of the industrial hygiene practices discussed here were ever implemented on any of the vessels Mr. Perkins worked on.	US Response: 78:21- 81:25 Relevant to the asbestos control procedures at PSNS	O

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT'S RULING
82:12-83:2	Relevance, lack of foundation, calls for speculation. There is no evidence that any of the industrial hygiene practices discussed here were ever implemented on any of the vessels Mr. Perkins worked on.	US Response: 82:12-83:2 Relevant to the asbestos control procedures at PSNS and shipboard	O
83:10-14	Relevance.	US Response: 83:10-14 Relevant to the asbestos control procedures at PSNS and shipboard	O
84:3-18	Relevance, Mr. Perkins never worked as a pipefitter.	US Response: 84:3-18 Relevant to the asbestos control at PSNS.	O
85:1-86:3	Relevance, hearsay, lack of foundation, calls for speculation. There is no evidence that any of the industrial hygiene practices discussed here were ever implemented on any of the vessels Mr. Perkins worked on.	US Response: 85:1-86:3 Relevant to the asbestos control procedures at PSNS and shipboard. Testifying from his own personal knowledge.	O
86:14-90:3	Relevance, hearsay, lack of foundation, calls for speculation. There is no evidence that any of the industrial hygiene practices discussed here were ever implemented on any of the vessels Mr. Perkins worked on.	US Response: 86:14-90:3 Relevant to the asbestos control procedures at PSNS. Testifying from his own personal knowledge.	O

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT'S RULING
91:6-24	Relevance, hearsay, lack of foundation, calls for speculation. There is no evidence that any of the industrial hygiene practices discussed here were ever implemented on any of the vessels Mr. Perkins worked on.	US Response: 91:6-24 Relevant to the asbestos control procedures at PSNS. Testifying from his own personal knowledge.	O
92:5- 93:14	Relevance, time frame of the photo unknown, hearsay, lack of foundation, vague.		O
95:6-97:3	Relevance, hearsay, lack of foundation, calls for speculation. There is no evidence that any of the industrial hygiene practices discussed here were ever implemented on any of the vessels Mr. Perkins worked on.	US Response: 95:6-97:3 Testifying from his own personal knowledge. Relevant to the asbestos control procedures at PSNS	O
97:16-98:13	Relevance, unknown time frame, hearsay, lacks foundation.		O
98:24-100:2	relevance, unclear what time frame		O
101:16-21	Relevance, calls for speculation, lack of foundation.	US Response: 101:16-21 Included for completeness of Plaintiff's designation	O
101:22-102:9	Relevance, outside time frame. Vague, lacks foundation, hearsay.		O
103:1-3	Leading, lack of foundation, calls for speculation.		O

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT'S RULING
103:6-105:20	Relevance.	US Response: 103:6 - 105:20 relevant to the Asbestos control policies at PSNS during the relevant time frame	O
106:18-107:19	Relevance, calls for speculation.	US Response: 106:18-107:19 relevant to the Asbestos control policies at PSNS during the relevant time frame and the 1970 publication. Witness testifying from personal knowledge	O
108:9-110:1	Relevance; calls for speculation, lack of foundation. There is no evidence that ship's force or machinist's mates like Mr. Perkins ever participated in the lectures or meetings described here.	US Response: 108:9-110:1 relevant to the Asbestos control policies and procedures at PSNS during the relevant time frame	O
110:5-12	Relevance; calls for speculation, lack of foundation. There is no evidence that ship's force or machinist's mates like Mr. Perkins ever participated in the lectures or meetings described here.	US Response: 110:5-12 relevant to the Asbestos control policies and procedures at PSNS during the relevant time frame	O
111:1-112:20	Relevance; calls for speculation, lack of foundation. There is no evidence that Mr. Perkins ever observed any asbestos warning labels on any product.	US Response: 111:1-112:20 relevant to the Asbestos control policies and procedures at PSNS during the relevant time frame	O

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT'S RULING
112:25-113:6	Relevance; calls for speculation, lack of foundation. There is no evidence that Mr. Perkins ever went into the pipe shop or the tool room described here.	US Response: 112:25 -113:6 relevant to the Asbestos control policies and procedures at PSNS during the relevant time frame	O
113:20-114:5	Relevance; calls for speculation, lack of foundation. There is no evidence that Mr. Perkins ever observed any asbestos warning signs.	US Response: 113:20-114:5 relevant to the Asbestos control policies and procedures at PSNS during the relevant time frame	O
117:22-119:7	Relevance, calls for speculation, lack of foundation. Mr. Perkins never worked as a pipefitter and this Court dismissed Plaintiff's claims based on the Navy's failure to provide Mr. Perkins with protective equipment like a dust respirator. DKT. 23		S
121:2-10	Incomplete designation, vague as to time and who the "workers" at PSNS are.		O
121:23-122:12	Relevance, calls for speculation, lack of foundation. There is no indication that Mr. Perkins was ever furnished this information and this Court dismissed Plaintiff's claims based on the Navy's failure to provide Mr. Perkins with protective equipment like a dust respirator. DKT. 23		S

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT'S RULING
122:18-21	Relevance, calls for speculation, lack of foundation. There is no indication that Mr. Perkins was ever furnished this information and this Court dismissed Plaintiff's claims based on the Navy's failure to provide Mr. Perkins with protective equipment like a dust respirator. DKT. 23.		S
123:4-125:9	Relevance, hearsay, lack of foundation, calls for speculation. There is no evidence that any of the industrial hygiene practices discussed here were ever implemented on any of the vessels Mr. Perkins worked on.	US Response: 123:4-125:9 relevant to the Asbestos control policies and procedures at PSNS during the relevant time frame. Witness is testifying from his own personal knowledge	O
125:22-126:23	Relevance; hearsay, calls for speculation, lack of foundation. There is no evidence that Mr. Perkins ever observed any asbestos warning labels on any product.		O
128:23-129:13	Relevance, calls for speculation, lack of foundation. Mr. Perkins never worked as a pipefitter or insulator and this Court dismissed Plaintiff's claims based on the Navy's failure to provide Mr. Perkins with protective equipment like a dust respirator. DKT. 23		S

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT'S RULING
130:3-9	Relevance, calls for speculation, lack of foundation. Mr. Perkins never worked as a pipefitter and this Court dismissed Plaintiff's claims based on the Navy's failure to provide Mr. Perkins with protective equipment like a dust respirator. DKT. 23		S
132:24-133:17	Relevance, calls for speculation, lack of foundation. Mr. Perkins was not an employee of PSNS and there is no evidence that he received any training referenced herein.	US Response: 132:24-133:17 relevant to the Asbestos control policies and procedures at PSNS during the relevant time frame. Witness is testifying from his own personal knowledge	O
135:5-20	Relevance, hearsay, lack of foundation.	US Response: 135:5-20 relevant to the exemplary Asbestos control policies and procedures at PSNS during the relevant time frame. Witness is testifying from his own personal knowledge	O
136:15-24	Relevance.		O
144:23-145:23	Relevance, hearsay, lack of foundation. Mr. Perkins never worked as an insulator.	US Response: 144:23-145:23 Relevant to the asbestos controls and procedures at PSNS.	O

DEPOSITION OF CARL MANGOLD, VOLUME 2
Taken on December 3, 2004
Braaten v. Certainteed Corporation, et al.
149th Judicial District, Brazoria County District Court
Case No. 25489

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT'S RULING
181:1-15	Relevance, incomplete designation.		O
186:25-189:15	Relevance, outside time frame of case and unclear if this testimony is about PSNS. Vague, confusing.		O
219:7-23	Relevance, Vague, confusing, lacks foundation.		O
257:5- 258:18	Relevance, outside time frame of case, Vague, confusing, lacks foundation. Opinion testimony.		O
277:17-25	Relevance, calls for speculation, lack of foundation. Mr. Perkins never worked as a pipefitter or insulator and this Court dismissed Plaintiff's claims based on the Navy's failure to provide Mr. Perkins with protective equipment like a dust respirator. DKT. 23	277:17-25 Response: Relevant to the asbestos control practices at PSNS during the relevant time frame	O
307:17- 308:10	Relevance, outside time frame of case, Vague, confusing, lacks foundation. Opinion testimony.		O

DEPOSITION OF SHIRLEY RABB
Taken on September 12, 2023
Perkins v. USA
Western Washington District Court
No. 3:22-cv-05701-RJB

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT'S RULING
24:25-26:8	Relevance, outside time frame of case.		O
66:4-70:11	Relevance		O
73:18-21	Calls for speculation.	Response: 73:18-21 witness testifying to her own personal knowledge.	O
74:14-17	Relevance, calls for speculation, lacks foundation. There is no evidence that mesothelioma is associated with smoking to any degree.	Response: 74:14-17 Relevant to the heath of decedent, Geraldine Perkins. witness testifying to her own personal knowledge.	O
75:5-13	Relevance, calls for speculation, lacks foundation.	Response: 75:5-13 Relevant to the heath of decedent, Geraldine Perkins. witness testifying to her own personal knowledge.	O

PAGE / LINE NO.	NATURE OF OBJECTION	RESPONSE	COURT'S RULING
76:9-20	Relevance, calls for speculation, lacks foundation.	Response: 76:9-20 Relevant to the heath of decedent, Geraldine Perkins. witness testifying to her own personal knowledge.	O
77:1-79:21	Relevance, calls for speculation, lacks foundation.	Response: 77:1-79:21 Relevant to the heath of decedent, Geraldine Perkins. witness testifying to her own personal knowledge.	O
80:3-83:3	Relevance, calls for speculation, lacks foundation.	Response: 80:3-83:3 Relevant to the heath of decedent, Geraldine Perkins. witness testifying to her own personal knowledge.	O
83:10-20	Relevance, calls for speculation, lacks foundation.	Response: 83:10-21 Relevant to the heath of decedent, Geraldine Perkins, damages. witness testifying to her own personal knowledge.	O
84:11- 85:12	Relevance		O